

Comment on the proposed designation of *Anomalina ariminensis* d'Orbigny in Fornasini, 1902 as the type species of *Anomalina* d'Orbigny, 1826 (Foraminiferida)
(Case 2906; see BZN 54: 6–10)

L.C. Hottinger

*Geologisch-Paläontologisches Institut der Universität Basel, Bernoullistrasse 32,
CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland*

I fully support Stefan Revets's application to designate *Anomalina ariminensis* d'Orbigny in Fornasini, 1902 as the type species of *Anomalina* d'Orbigny, 1826, rather than the indeterminate nominal species *A. punctulata* d'Orbigny, 1826, on the grounds explained in Revets's text. Approval by the Commission will add to future stability in the nomenclature of the smaller benthic foraminifera. The proposal is supported by an extensive monograph (Revets, 1996b) setting modern standards in this neglected and difficult group of foraminifera.

The application is clearly written, to the point and accurate. I recommend its approval as it stands.

Comment on the proposed conservation of *Umbellula* Cuvier, [1797] (Cnidaria, Anthozoa) as the correct original spelling, and corrections to the entries relating to *Umbellularia* Lamarck, 1801 on the Official Lists and Indexes of Names in Zoology
(Case 2999; see BZN 54: 14–18)

P.F.S. Cornelius

*Department of Zoology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road,
London SW7 5BD, U.K.*

I would like to make the following comment on the recent application by Dr F.M. Bayer and Dr M. Grasshoff. I fully support the proposal to retain the existing spelling, *Umbellula*. The spelling *Ombellula* is virtually unused; as Collection Manager of the Cnidaria collections of The Natural History Museum, London I have been familiar with the spelling *Umbellula* for more than 25 years and have never encountered *Ombellula* either in dealing with the collections or in the literature. The proposal by Williams (1995) to adopt the spelling *Ombellula* was reckless, and this name should be suppressed at the earliest opportunity. Such a totally unpragmatic proposal as Williams's causes unwarranted confusion and timewasting and, if allowed to succeed, would denigrate nomenclature and the Commission itself.

Comment on the proposed suppression for nomenclatural purposes of S.D. Kaicher's *Card Catalogue of World-Wide Shells* (1973–1992)
(Case 2964; see BZN 53: 96–98, 273–277; 54: 39–46)

Anders Warén

*Department of Invertebrate Zoology, Swedish Museum of Natural History,
Stockholm, Sweden*

I have followed the debate on Kaicher's *Card Catalogue* and was a little surprised at the reactions when I read the comments in BZN 54: 39-46 (March 1997).

I discussed the problem of figuring type material with Mrs Kaicher long ago because she was interested in figuring some type material I then had on loan from the Smithsonian Institution. She explained to me very clearly that her intention was not to interfere with taxonomic procedures, only to figure accurately as many different species as possible. Furthermore, she liked to figure type material when difficult groups were involved (in my case gastropods of the family EULIMIDAE). The reason for this was that if she did so it was more likely that her photographs would show the right species. The reason was not the other way round, i.e. that her cards should set the standard for interpretation of the name.

To suppress the *Card Catalogue* for nomenclatural purposes does not in any way reduce Kaicher's very useful contribution to identification of molluscs and cannot be considered disrespectful to an amateur who has contributed more in this field than most professionals.

Comment on the proposed conservation of the names *Geopeltis* Regteren Altena, 1949, *Geoteuthis* Münster, 1843, *Jeletzkyteuthis* Doyle, 1990, *Loligosepia* Quenstedt, 1839, *Parabelopeltis* Naef, 1921, *Paraplesioteuthis* Naef, 1921 and *Belemntheutis montefiorei* Buckman, 1880 (Mollusca, Coleoidea)
(Case 2987; see BZN 53: 253-260; 54: 104)

W. Riegraf

Brüggefeldweg 31, D-48161 Münster, Germany

There are no doubts among coleoid researchers that the complex taxonomic meaning of *Belemnosepia* Buckland & Agassiz in Buckland, 1836 urgently needs to be resolved by the Commission. This is the intention of the application by Engeser & Donovan and it has my support.

On a point of detail, Engeser & Donovan state in their application (p. 256) that 'No type species has ever been validly designated for *Belemnosepia*. Six of the species attributed to *Belemnosepia* by d'Orbigny are type species or subjective synonyms of other genera ...', and they then list *Geopeltis* Regteren Altena, 1949, *Geoteuthis* Münster, 1843, *Jeletzkyteuthis* Doyle, 1990, *Loligosepia* Quenstedt, 1839, *Parabelopeltis* Naef, 1921 and *Paraplesioteuthis* Naef, 1921. No nominal species were originally included in *Belemnosepia* by Buckland & Agassiz. Article 69a(1)1 of the Code states that 'If no nominal species was included at the time the nominal genus or subgenus was established, the nominal species that were first subsequently and expressly included in it ... are deemed to be the only originally included nominal species'. It could be argued that the type species of *Belemnosepia* must be one of the species illustrated by Buckland (1836b of Engeser & Donovan's references) in pl. 44' which is headed 'Illustrations of the genus *Belemnosepia*'. However, this argument cannot be sustained since the text explanation of pl. 44' is headed 'Illustrations of the probable nature of the animals that gave origin to Belemnites' and includes the living *Sepia officinalis* Linnaeus, 1758. From my point of view the nominal species listed were 'expressly' included in *Belemnosepia*.